EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	VC/NIC				
17	NIO/ECON	X	✓		
18	D/OGI/DI		X		
19	ES		X		
20					
21					
22					

SUSPENSE ____________ Date

Remarks

STAT

Executive Secretary

6 March 86

Date

3637 (10-81)

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/06/28 : CIA-RDP88G01117R000602150003-4

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ATTACHMENT

Executive Registry
86- 0941x

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

CABINET AFFAIRS STAFFING MEMORANDUM

Date: 3/6/86 **Number:** 317066CA **Due By:**

Subject: ECONOMIC POLICY COUNCIL MEETING -- MARCH 7, 1986
10:00 A.M. -- Roosevelt Room

	Action	FYI
ALL CABINET MEMBERS	☐	☐
Vice President	☑	☐
State	☑	☐
Treasury	☑	☐
Defense	☐	☑
Justice	☐	☑
Interior	☐	☐
Agriculture	☑	☐
Commerce	☑	☐
Labor	☑	☐
HHS	☐	☐
HUD	☐	☐
Transportation	☑	☐
Energy	☐	☐
Education	☐	☐
Chief of Staff	☑	☐
OMB	☑	☐
CIA	☐	☑
UN	☐	☐
USTR	☑	☐
EPA	☐	☐
GSA	☐	☐
NASA	☐	☐
OPM	☐	☐
SBA	☐	☐
VA	☐	☐

	Action	FYI
CEA	☑	☐
CEQ	☐	☐
OSTP	☐	☐
Poindexter	☑	☐
Svahn	☑	☐
Chew *(For WH Staffing)*	☑	☐
Executive Secretary for:		
DPC	☐	☐
EPC	☑	☐

REMARKS:

There will be an Economic Policy Council Meeting on Friday, March 7, at 10:00 A.M. in the Roosevelt Room.

The agenda and background papers are attached.

RETURN TO:

☑ Alfred H. Kingon
Cabinet Secretary
456-2823
(Ground Floor, West Wing)

☐ Don Clarey
☐ Rick Davis
☐ Ed Stucky

Associate Director
Office of Cabinet Affairs
456–2800 (Room 235, OEOB)

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 5, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ECONOMIC POLICY COUNCIL

FROM: EUGENE J. McALLISTER EM

SUBJECT: Agenda and Papers for the March 7 Meeting

The agenda and papers for the March 7 meeting of the Economic Policy Council are attached. The meeting is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room.

The first agenda item will be FmHA lending. The Working Group on Federal Credit Policy has prepared a paper describing FmHA's loan obligations and the problem that fourteen states have exhausted already their annual direct operating loan allocations. Total demand for such loans is also expected to exceed supply. The Working Group has prepared three options for the Council's consideration, which are described in the attached paper.

The second agenda item will be Canadian trade issues. The President will meet with Prime Minister Mulroney on March 18. The United States Trade Representative has prepared an attached paper which outlines the status of a number of U.S.-Canadian bilateral trade disputes and presents some preliminary thoughts on the scope of the free trade negotiations. The Council will consider these issues and how the President might address them in his meeting with the Prime Minister.

Confidential Attachment

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

ECONOMIC POLICY COUNCIL

March 7, 1986

10:00 a.m.

Roosevelt Room

AGENDA

1. FmHA Lending
2. Canadian Trade Issues

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 5, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ECONOMIC POLICY COUNCIL

FROM: THE WORKING GROUP ON FEDERAL CREDIT POLICY

SUBJECT: Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) Lending

ISSUE

For fiscal year 1986, the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) has $1.5 billion in direct operating loan authority; $389 million in direct farm ownership loans authority; and, $1.3 billion in emergency distaster loan authority. In addition, the FmHA has $1.8 billion in guaranteed loan authority.

The Administration is facing an immediate problem:

o Fourteen states have exhausted their direct operating loan allocations.

o It appears that total demand for FmHA direct operating loans will greatly exceed the $1.5 billion available for FY 1986, possibly by as much as $1.2 billion.

BACKGROUND

o Since 1983, demand for FmHA direct loans has increased substantially, in part because of retrenchment in agricultural banks and the Farm Credit System. In 1985, the Administration transferred $1.6 billion from the emergency loan program, which had no statutory cap, to the direct operating loan program. The 1985 Farm Bill capped the emergency loan program at $1.3 billion.

FmHA OBLIGATIONS
(in million $)

Year	Direct	Guaranteed	Emergency
1983	2,424	71	566
1984	2,618	153	1,052
1985	4,253	1,175	491
1986 authority (Gramm-Rudman)	1,892	1,910	1,244

- Between one-half and three-fourths of FmHA's 270,000 borrowers will have extreme difficulty in servicing their debt. Most have debt to asset ratios exceeding .7 percent and cash flow shortfalls in excess of $50,000 after accounting for non-farm income, living expenses, and debt repayment.

- FmHA's portfolio is concentrated in the southern states where it holds approximately 23 percent of all farm operating debt.

- Congressional pressure from the southeast states is building to ease FmHA requirements that all borrowers must cash-flow to be eligible for additional loans. Unless special servicing options are used, as many as 50 percent of FmHA borrowers in Mississippi who received operating loans last year will not this year because of cash-flow problems. If the cash-flow requirement is relaxed, demand for FmHA direct loans will be substantially greater than now estimated.

CURRENT LENDING

USDA allocates authority for direct operating, direct ownership, emergency disaster, and guaranteed loans to states according to historical demand.

Direct Operating Loans

- $805 million of the $1.5 billion direct operating loans have been obligated.

- 60 percent of the obligations have gone to existing borrowers, 40 percent to new borrowers.

- 69 percent of the obligations are at the highly subsidized limited resource interest rate of 7.25 percent, as compared with a normal rate of 10.25 percent and a commercial rate of 12.5 percent.

- Fourteen states, including Alabama, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming have exhausted their annual allocations.

Direct Farm Ownership Loans

- $172 million of the $398 million direct ownership loans have been obligated.

- 83 percent have gone to existing borrowers; 17 percent to new borrowers.

- 70 percent of obligations are at the highly subsidized, limited resource interest rate of 5.25 percent as compared with a normal rate of 10.75 percent and a commercial rate of 12.4 percent.

- Arkansas and Louisiana have exhausted their annual allocations; ten states including Alabama, Colorado, Delaward, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Carolina, Utah, and West Virginia, and Puerto Rico are in imminent danger of doing so (i.e. have less than $150,000 per state)

<u>Emergency Disaster Loan Program</u>

- $46 million of the $1.3 billion emergency disaster funds have been obligated.

- No states are in funding difficulty.

<u>DEMAND FOR LOANS</u>

The Administration is faced with a major problem: demand for direct operating loans greatly exceeds supply, particularly in the southern and grain belt states.

Demand for FmHA funds, overall, is down 20 percent from this time last year, but the explanation for this decline is not clear. The substantial value of deficiency payments that farmers will receive this year may explain the decline. On the other hand, the decline may instead be due to a delay in issuing Farm Bill regulations, suggesting that demand may surge later in the season to traditional levels.

FmHA has undertaken a number of policies to attempt to diminish the demand for government loans, but these policies will not have much effect in the short term.

- FmHA plans to issue new regulations that will limit demand for direct loans by implementing loan eligibility criteria based on debt/asset ratios and other pertinent financial data. Rule-making procedures will not permit this to be in place in time to help this year.

- FmHA is reviewing a plan to request permission to support legislation that would limit any qualified borrower to no more than 7 years on the direct operating loan program, thus forcing borrowers to graduate to private sector lenders within a certain time.

- Approximately 65,000 FmHA borrowers have received letters stating that they must make arrangements to begin clearing up their delinquent accounts before they receive operating credit this year. These borrowers have probably not gotten in the queue.

OPTIONS

The Working Group on Federal Credit Policy had developed three options for the Council's consideration:

Option 1: Accept the current program authorization and direct those borrowers eligible under the law to the guarantee program.

Advantage

- Sends a clear signal consistent with the Gramm-Rudman Act.

Disadvantage

- Congress will likely enact a supplemental, probably adding report language opening the program further.

Option 2: Transfer $700 million from the emergency loan program to the direct operating loan program and $50 million from the guaranteed business and industry program to guaranteed operating loans.

The Secretary is permitted ordinarily to reprogram up to 7 percent of agency funds. Because this option would reprogram greater than 7 percent, the Secretary would have to justify the transfers as "emergency".

Advantages

- Places the Administration in a position of acting before Congress does.
- Will not harm the contributing programs because funds will not be needed during this fiscal year (based on current utilization rates).
- Does not conflict with Gramm-Rudman; will not increase outlays.

Disadvantage

- Depending on the demand, may buy the Administration only a few months before we must again face the crunch for direct operating loans.

Option 3: Transfer up to 25 percent of the guaranteed loan program ($430 million) to the direct loan program, as specifically allowed in the Farm Bill.

Advantage

- Places the Administration in a position of acting before Congress does.

Disadvantages

- Reverses longstanding Administration policy of shifting from direct to guaranteed loans.
- May encourage private sector lenders to transfer their weaker clients to FmHA.
- Would increase budget outlays because direct loans are budgeted as outlays, while guarantees are not.

Note: Because deficiency payments and direct loan authorizations will decline substantially in FY 1987, Administration options for meeting demands next year will be fewer.

CONFIDENTIAL

THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE
WASHINGTON
20506

March 5, 1986

MEMORANDUM TO THE ECONOMIC POLICY COUNCIL

FROM: CLAYTON YEUTTER CY

SUBJECT: Free Trade Talks with Canada

ISSUE

The visit of Prime Minister Mulroney on March 18 provides an excellent opportunity to impress upon the Canadians the importance of carefully managing our bilateral relationship to ensure Congressional support for the upcoming free trade talks. To do this, we must (1) achieve significant progress in major bilateral disputes within the next month; (2) discourage the announcement of new Canadian policies disadvantageous to U.S. interests; and (3) emphasize to our Canadian counterparts the necessity of refraining from limiting the scope of the trade talks before they begin.

RECOMMENDATION

The EPC recommends that during his March 18 meeting with Prime Minister Mulroney, the President:

- stress his belief that the free trade talks are in America's and Canada's best interest

- but emphasize that for the talks to proceed

  -- we must have a resolution within the next week of the long-standing book publishing issue and by April 15 on lumber

  -- Canada should avoid introducing new restrictive measures, such as those contemplated for limiting investment in "culturally sensitive" industries such as film distribution

  -- we should refrain from limiting the scope of the talks before they begin. Individual sectors or issues should not be removed from the negotiating table.

CONFIDENTIAL

The President should emphasize to the Prime Minister that without visible progress on these issues by the mid-April deadline imposed by our law, the Congress could deny authority for the negotiations.

BACKGROUND

A. Bilateral Disputes

Progress with Canada on a number of bilateral fronts is essential both to generate needed goodwill in the relationship and to avoid possible Congressional disapproval of the talks. The major bilateral disputes currently facing us are: (1) lumber; (2) compulsory licensing of pharmaceutical patents; (3) Canada's forced divestiture laws, specifically the Gulf & Western case on book publishing; (4) discriminatory provincial liquor boards' practices affecting wine; and (5) uranium processing requirements.

1. Lumber

The U.S. softwood lumber industry charges that Canadian provincial practices unfairly subsidize Canadian lumber producers by providing standing timber at prices below fair market value. The Canadians counter that a Department of Commerce ruling in a 1983 countervailing duty investigation vindicates their stumpage pricing practices. The EPC addressed this issue on November 26 and agreed that talks should be begun with the Canadians focusing on:

- o addressing the questionable elements in Canada's stumpage systems;
- o eliminating Canadian log export restrictions;
- o reducing Canadian tariffs on imports of U.S. finished wood products; and
- o encouraging Canada to adopt satisfactory plywood performance standards.

These lumber talks are now underway to explore ways in which the current market situation could be improved and to develop more information on how the Canadian stumpage system works in practice. Unfortunately, lumber is the one bilateral dispute with the greatest potential for adversely affecting Congressional consideration of the free trade talks, especially in the Senate Finance Committee. At this point, a bilateral resolution of the lumber dispute appears unlikely. Barring movement by the Canadians the EPC will have to convene within the next month to consider options for unilateral action by the U.S. to "level the playing field."

2. Compulsory Licensing of Pharmaceutical Patents

Canadian patent law contains a provision that requires the granting of compulsory licenses to Canadian-based businesses for pharmaceutical patents held by U.S. and other foreign interests, and the payment of an artificially low royalty of four percent to the innovator of the pharmaceutical. In 1983 the Canadian Government announced its intention to modify its patent law, but changes in the government delayed action. The announced impending change in the law did, however, motivate the generic industry to file compulsory license applications for virtually all significant drugs not yet licensed. We have had intense negotiations on this issue for several months. That effort has paid off, and we now expect the Mulroney government to introduce legislation satisfactory to the U.S. pharmaceutical industry within a few days. Unfortunately, on March 4, the Canadian Government granted final regulatory approval for the marketing of a generic version of Feldine, one of Pfizer's top money makers in Canada.

3. Forced Divestiture and Gulf & Western

In mid-1985, Canada's Foreign Investment Review Agency was abolished by legislation and replaced by Investment Canada, with a mandate to promote, rather than to discourage, foreign investment in Canada. However, in July 1985 Canada announced a restrictive foreign investment policy in the book publishing and distribution sector. This policy was applied retroactively to a December 1984 acquisition by Gulf & Western Industries of Prentice Hall, a United States firm with a major Canadian subsidiary. The Canadian Government is attempting to force Gulf & Western to divest control of Prentice Hall-Canada either via joint venture or sale. We have strenuously objected to this discriminatory restriction on foreign investment. Sometimes contentious discussions between the Canadian Government and Gulf & Western continue. It remains unclear whether a mutually-satisfactory resolution of the case is possible. The EPC is investigating two possible alternative courses of action in this case: the introduction of mirror legislation or the filing of a Section 301 case.

4. Wine

The sale of wine in Canada is controlled by provincial government liquor control boards. These boards maintain trade barriers that discriminate against U.S. and foreign wines. Consultations with both the federal and provincial governments on wine are scheduled for March 13-14, at which time we will insist on immediate improvements in market access in Ontario and Quebec, and a commitment to address longstanding problems with provincial liquor board practices in the free trade talks. We are considering possible action against Canada under Section 301 as part of a broader initiative aimed at foreign restrictions on U.S. alcoholic beverage exports.

5. Uranium

The Canadian Government requires that uranium be processed in Canada before it can be exported. Although exemptions to this policy have been granted in the past, the current Canadian Government has indicated that its enforcement of these trade restrictive provisions will be tightened. After we threatened a GATT case challenging the uranium processing requirements, the Canadian Government has indicated a desire to resolve the dispute bilaterally, and consultations are scheduled for March 11.

B. New Restrictive Policies

Every effort must be made to ensure that new policies or practices disadvantageous to U.S. interests are not announced or implemented by Canada prior to the start of full scale bilateral negotiations. The Canadians cannot expect us to pay for the removal of barriers or restrictive practices put in place on the eve of negotiations. This is especially relevant to current Canadian consideration of restrictive investment policies affecting film distribution and other so-called cultural industries. We should emphasize the adverse response such action would provoke from both the Administration and the Congress, perhaps even jeopardizing the trade talks themselves.

C. Scope of the Negotiations

The overall objective of the negotiations will be to come as close to free and open borders between our two countries as we possibly can. Our negotiating model will be the U.S.-Israel free trade arrangement, which was finalized in 1985. The negotiations will be conducted by USTR, but broad agency participation will be required because of the magnitude of the task. Specific negotiating objectives will be considered on an interagency basis within the EPC structure.

The Canadian proposal for bilateral trade negotiations provides a historic opportunity for us to address the whole range of Canadian practices and policies adversely affecting U.S. commercial interests. Specifically, U.S. businesses face a large number of barriers in attempting to penetrate the Canadian market, including:

o high Canadian tariffs across a wide spectrum of products, averaging close to 9 percent compared to a U.S. average of around 4 percent. (Among the areas of particular interest are furniture, telecommunications equipment, and paper products);

o nontariff barriers at both the federal and provincial level (of particular concern are provincial restrictions on the distribution of alcoholic beverages, federal and provincial procurement preferences affecting telecommunications equipment and power generating equipment, and federal restrictions on imports of eggs, chickens, and turkeys);

- obstacles to foreign investment (particularly affecting the energy, financial services, and book publishing and other cultural sectors);

- federal and provincial regulations which impede U.S. exports of services (of particular interest are the transportation, insurance, and information sectors);

- inadequate protection of intellectual property such as trademarks, copyrights and patents (major U.S. interests are the compulsory licensing system affecting pharmaceutical patents, the lack of copyright protection for broadcasting from U.S. retransmitted in Canada via cable, and establishment of a multinational or regional patent office);

- federal and provincial subsidies across a wide spectrum of product sectors (recent complaints have been received from the U.S. paper and mining sectors).

Canadian objectives, while yet to be expressed in any detail, appear to focus on the following areas:

- security of access to the U.S. market (particularly, greater predictability of treatment under U.S. trade remedy law);

- improved access to the U.S. market (key interests include elimination of federal and state "Buy America" preferences and selected high U.S. tariffs such as petrochemicals);

- an effective dispute settlement mechanism to police the agreement and address future bilateral disputes.

In order to maintain the broadest possible support in the U.S. for the trade talks, we must encourage the Canadian Government to refrain from announcing exclusions from the negotiations before they begin. This includes questions of product coverage, the trade practices of Canadian provinces, definitions of cultural industries, and the extent to which investment issues will be discussed. Decisions regarding the scope of the negotiations should be decided at the negotiating table, not in the newspapers.

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date: 6 MARCH 1986

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. DIRECTOR OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

	Action		File		Note and Return
	Approval		For Clearance		Per Conversation
	As Requested		For Correction		Prepare Reply
	Circulate	XXXX	For Your Information		See Me
	Comment		Investigate		Signature
	Coordination		Justify		

REMARKS

cc: DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL
D/OF
COMPTROLLER
EXDIR
IG-AUDIT

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

STAT

5041-102 *USGPO 1983-421-529/320 **OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)** Prescribed by GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

THE JOINT FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

PRESENTS THE

15TH ANNUAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

on "MANAGING RESOURCES IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT"

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1986

The Joint Financial Management Improvement Program is a joint undertaking of the Department of the Treasury, the Office of Management and Budget, the General Accounting Office and the Office of Personnel Management, working in cooperation with each other and with operating agencies to improve and coordinate financial management practices.

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVE: To discuss dynamic, key issues and share experiences in improving the management of resources in this changing environment. The Conference will concentrate on the implication of the future of financial management under the Gramm-Rudman Act. Specific coverage will be given to the management of productivity improvements; the integration of financial management functions and systems; and future directions in the auditing and financial management areas in the public sector.

CONFERENCE AWARD: The Donald L. Scantlebury Memorial Awards for financial management improvement will be presented during the luncheon session.

LOCATION: J.W. Marriott Hotel
1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.
Washington, D.C.

This hotel is within 5 minutes walking distance of the Metro Center subway stop.

COST: $75 per participant

TIME: All participants should sign in between 7 AM and 8:45 AM on the morning of the conference. The program will start promptly at 9 AM. Signs will direct you to the conference registration desks.

Share this flyer and any extra
copies with others in your office

CONFERENCE AGENDA

MORNING SESSION

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: JAMES A. BAKER, III
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

WORKSHOP: THE FUTURE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT UNDER GRAMM-RUDMAN

Leader: DAVID V. DUKES, Executive Director, JFMIP

Speakers: JAMES L. BLUM, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis
Congressional Budget Office

HARRY S. HAVENS, Assistant Comptroller General
General Accounting Office

DAVID G. MATHIASEN, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget
Office of Management and Budget

HOWARD MESSNER, Assistant Administrator for
Administration and Resources Management
Environmental Protection Agency

LUNCHEON SESSION

PRESENTATION of the DONALD L. SCANTLEBURY MEMORIAL AWARDS

CHARLES A. BOWSHER, Comptroller General of the United States

AFTERNOON SESSION

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: JAMES C. MILLER, III
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

CONCURRENT WORKSHOPS:
1. MANAGING FOR PRODUCTIVITY IMPROVEMENTS
Leader: CAROLE DINEEN, Associate Director for Management
Office of Management and Budget

Topics and Speakers:
"An Agency's Perspective"
JON SEYMOUR, Assistant Secretary for Administration
Department of Transportation

"A Central Agency's Perspective"
BRIAN USILANER, Associate Director, National Productivity
General Government Division
General Accounting Office

"A Private Industry's Perspective"
KENNETH KILDERRY, Director, Organization and Operations
Consulting
Westinghouse Corporation

WILLIAM SHEA, Manager of Productivity Consulting
Westinghouse Corporation

CONFERENCE AGENDA

2. FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN AUDITING
Leader: JAMES B. THOMAS, JR., Inspector General
Department of Education

Topics and Speakers:
"Quality Review of CPA's"
FREDERICK D. WOLF, Director, Accounting and Financial Management Division
General Accounting Office

"President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency Initiatives"
JAMES RICHARDS, Inspector General, Department of the Interior

"Future Directions in State Auditing"
THOMAS HAYES, Auditor General, State of California

3. INTEGRATING FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS

Leader: JOHN J. LORDAN, Deputy Associate Director for Financial Management
Office of Management and Budget

Topics and Speakers:
"Standard General Ledger"
DALE McOMBER, Formerly Assistant Director for Budget Review
Office of Management and Budget

"Use of Cross-Servicing Among Agencies"
DENNIS C. BOYD, Deputy Associate Director for Management Improvement, Office of Management and Budget

"Use of Existing Systems"
WILLIAM L. KENDIG, Director, Office of Financial Management
Department of the Interior

REGISTRATION INFORMATION

The cost of the one-day conference is $75. Attendance at this conference can be approved under the Government Employee's Training Act. Nominations from Federal agencies may be submitted by using OPM Standard Form 182 (Request for Training) to:

JFMIP CONFERENCE
OPM - TRAINING NOMINATIONS - WATDS
P.O. Box 7230
WASHINGTON DC 20044

Nomination for non-Federal employees should include checks made payable to the Office of Personnel Management.

Nomination forms will be accepted until March 4. Cancellations must be made in writing by March 8, or a billing will be made.

Since there is a large number of registrants, nominees will not be notified of acceptance. All nominations received before the due date will be accepted. All attendees should sign in at the conference registration desk between 7 AM and 8:45 AM on March 18. For further information on registration procedures, contact Tom Uttley, Tom Tate, Ed Murphy, or Bob French on (202) 632-5600.

JFMIP
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
MARCH 18, 1986

PARTICIPANT: ____________________

HOME ADDRESS:

____
____
____
____

HOME PHONE ( ) ____________

OFFICE ADDRESS:

____
____
____
____

OFFICE PHONE ( ) ____________

TUITION: $75

APPROPRIATION/FUND ____________

COURSE CODE: 23BA

BILLING: FURNISH INVOICE TO:

____
____
____
____

SIBAC/STANDARD DOCUMENT NUMBER

____

DOCUMENT/PURCHASE ORDER/REQUISITION NO.: ____________________

AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL:

SIGNATURE: ____________________

NAME: ____________________

TITLE: ____________________

PHONE: ____________________

RETURN COMPLETED NOMINATION TO:

JFMIP CONFERENCE
OPM TRAINING NOMINATIONS WATDS
P O BOX 7230
WASHINGTON D C 20044